

REMARKS

This communication is in response to the Office Action dated January 30, 2009 in which claims 1-21 and 23-32 were pending. Claims 1-17 have been allowed. Claims 18-21, 23-27, 29, 31, and 32 were rejected and Claims 28 and 30 were objected to.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-17 pending, original.

Claims 18-21 pending, added.

Claim 22 canceled.

Claims 23-32 pending, added.

Support for the Added Claims

Claim 18 is supported by the specification at col. 3, line 26-31; col. 4 lines 46-55; col. 5 lines 5-19; col. 8, lines 32-36; col. 17, lines 20-61; col. 31, lines 41-57; col. 5, lines 25-31; col. 31, line 65; col. 32, line 3; and original claims 1 and 4.

Claim 19 is supported by col. 29 line 21; col. 31, line 20 and original claim 1.

Claim 20 is supported by col. 5, lines 47-55; col. 32, lines 22-32 and original claim 2.

Claim 21 is supported by col. 5, lines 19-25; col. 31, lines 58-64; and original claim 3.

Claim 23 is supported by col. 5, lines 31-46; col. 32, lines 4-13; and original claim 5.

Claim 24 is supported by col. 5, line 48; col. 6, lines 4-9; col. 11, lines 14-18; col. 32, lines 31-56; col. 5, lines 25-31; col. 31, line 65; col. 32, line 3; FIG.s 1-3; and original claims 4, 9, and 10.

Claim 25 is supported by col.9, lines 43-59; and col. 13, lines 28-43.

Claim 26 is supported by col. 6, lines 11-23; col. 32, line 57; co. 33, line 5; col. 5, lines 25-31; col. 31, line 65; col. 32, line 3; and original claims 4 and 11.

Claim 27 is supported by col. 32, line 57 to col. 33, line 5.

Claim 28 is supported by col. 6, lines 41-43, col. 33, lines 1-29; and original claim 13.

Claim 29 is supported by col. 6, lines 23-36; col. 31, lines 1-39; col. 33, lines 6-13; and original claim 14.

Claim 30 is supported by col. 6, lines 23-36; col. 31, lines 1-39; col. 33, lines 14-23; and original claim 15.

Claim 31 is supported by col. 6, lines 48-62; col. 31, lines 40-58; col. 5, lines 25-31; col. 31, line 65; col. 32, line 3; and original claims 4 and 16.

Claim 32 is supported by col. 6, lines 62-65; col. 31, lines 40-58; and original claim 17.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 18-21, 23-27, 29, 31, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Rostoker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,668,809 – hereinafter “Rostoker”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 18-21, 23-27, 29, 31, and 32. Generally, Rostoker fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of the claims.

Specifically, Rostoker fails to disclose or suggest “remove the data protection code from the first packet, and store the first packet to a second memory without storing the first data protection code in the second memory”, as in Claim 18 and similarly in Claims 24, 26, and 31. Further, Rostoker fails to disclose “a data protection code generation circuit coupled to the first memory that generates and appends a second data protection code to the first packet when the first packet is moved from the second memory to the first memory”, as in Claim 18. Nowhere does Rostoker describe appending a second data protection code to a packet after a first data protection code has been removed from the packet. Rostoker does not even teach removing a data protection code from any packet. All that Rostoker teaches is generating a CRC32, which is a form of a data protection code, and appending that to the end of data. Rostoker does not teach removing an existing data protection code and generating a second data protection code.

In addition, in the Office Action dated June 24, 2008, the Examiner acknowledged that Rostoker failed to teach the elements of then pending Claim 22. The Applicant has incorporated

elements of Claim 22 into the independent Claims 18, 24, 26, and 31. While the Examiner makes statements that Rostoker's ATMizer teaches the elements of the claims, no citations to actual columns or line numbers have been given, nor has any specific language of Rostoker been cited. And upon review of Rostoker, Applicant can not find any language to support the Examiner's conclusions and rejection. Thus, Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's interpretation of Rostoker and asserts that the Examiner's statements are merely conclusory statements not supportable by Rostoker.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that Claims 18, 24, 26, and 31 are in condition for allowance. In addition, Claims 19-21, 23, 25, 27-30, and 32 are allowable as dependent claims depending from one of Claims 18, 24, 26, or 31. Even further, claims 19, 23, 25, 27, 29, and 32 contain additional patentable features which the Examiner has failed to address in the previous office action.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the notice of allowable subject matter of Claims 1-17, 28, and 30.

Conclusion

Applicant has pointed out specific features of the claims not disclosed, suggested, or rendered obvious by the reference applied in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of each of the rejections, as well as an indication of the allowability of each of the pending claims. If, for any reason, the Office is unable to allow the Application on the next Office Action, and believes a telephone interview would be helpful, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: /Kirk A. Cesari/
Kirk A. Cesari, Reg. No. 47,479
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

KAC:lah